



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/887,144	06/22/2001	Erland Cassel	026125-076	7758

7590

07/18/2003

Ronald L. Grudziecki
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

WIMER, MICHAEL C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2821

DATE MAILED: 07/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/887,144

Applicant(s)

CASSEL ET AL.

Examiner

Michael C. Wimer

Art Unit

2821

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 09 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.


NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 29.Claim(s) objected to: 22-24, 27 and 28.Claim(s) rejected: 17-21, 25, 26 and 30-32.Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____


Michael C. Wimer
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 2821

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: as set forth in the final Office action, all claimed structure is shown by Kenoun et al., with regard to Claims 17-21,25,26 and 30-32. Specifically, regarding Claim 17, applicant correctly characterizes the structure of Kenoun et al. in the fourth paragraph under the heading "REMARKS" and correctly cites the sections in the Kenoun et al. patent. Applicant emphasizes the only issue with Claim 17 (and Claim 30) is a portion of the antenna called a "feedback conductor". Contrary to the argument advanced in the first paragraph on the second page of the "REMARKS", the characterization of the second segment 58 is prime for fulfilling the term "feedback conductor". No "skill in the art" is required to clearly observe that the feedback conductor 58 extends along the radiator 10,56 (in a first direction) from the second end (at 68) thereof towards the first end (at 52,12) of the radiator, wherein the feedback conductor includes a second end 64, extending along the radiator in a second direction towards the second end (at 68) of the radiator. Kenoun et al. specifically describes the feedback conductor second end 64 "for tuning a frequency range of the antenna" (as claimed here) in column 4, third paragraph. It is the length of the offset portion 64 (of the third segment 62) of the feedback conductor which can be varied to adjust the bandwidth of the frequency response of the antenna 10 at the first and second resonant frequencies. The precise purpose of the feedback conductor in Kenoun et al is the same as that of applicant, i.e., it tunes the frequency range of the antenna. The final rejection stands.